

1 U.S. DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY
2
3 GLOBAL NUCLEAR ENERGY PARTNERSHIP)
4 PROGRAMMATIC ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT)
5 STATEMENT PUBLIC HEARING)
6

7 TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS had in the
8 above-entitled cause at The Holiday Inn Hotel and
9 Suites, Blue Iris Room, 205 Remington Boulevard,
10 Bolingbrook, Illinois, on the 4th day of December,
11 A.D. 2008, at 7:10 p.m.

12
13 REPORTED BY: JACQUELINE M. TIMMONS, CSR, RMR, RDR.
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24

1 MR. BROWN (Facilitator): If folks will take
2 their seats, we will get started with the public
3 comment section.

4 If folks will take their seats, we will
5 get started. We have a fair number of people
6 signed up to speak. Is this mic working, or are
7 people just not listening?

8 I think some of the -- if folks will
9 please be seated. And if you want to continue your
10 conversations, you can step out in the hallway. I
11 think some of the DOE folks are guilty here.

12 Thanks.

13 Okay. It is now time to receive your
14 formal comments for the draft PEIS. Could someone
15 close the doors back there. This is a very
16 talkative crowd.

17 So this is your opportunity to provide
18 DOE with reactions, additions and corrections to
19 the draft document. A court reporter will
20 transcribe your statement. Our reporter for
21 tonight is Jackie Timmons.

22 Let me review a few ground rules for the
23 formal comments. Please step up to the microphone
24 over there when your name is called, identify

1 yourself by name and organizational affiliation, if
2 that's appropriate. If you have a written version
3 of your statement, when you've completed your
4 statement, please give a copy to the court
5 reporter. Also, if you have additional documents
6 that you would like to see included in the formal
7 record, you may hand them to her at the same time.
8 They will be marked and also made part of the
9 official record.

10 I will call two names at a time, the
11 first of the speaker and the second of the person
12 who is to follow. In view of the number of people
13 who have indicated interest in speaking this
14 evening, please confine your public statement to
15 five minutes. A staff person will be seated in the
16 front of the podium and will hold up a sign
17 indicating when you have one minute remaining. At
18 that point, if you can please summarize your
19 remaining points. And, again, in view of the
20 number of people who signed up, if you can please
21 adhere strictly to the five minutes.

22 Mr. Griffiths will be serving as a
23 hearing officer for the Department of Energy this
24 evening. He will, however, not be responding to

1 questions or comments during the session. So with
2 that, by way of introduction, let me begin the list
3 of speakers.

4 Our first speaker is Kathy Gere, and she
5 will be followed by Mike Herzog.

6 Is Kathy ready? Go to that podium
7 there. Thanks very much.

8 MS. KATHY GERE: Good evening, and thank you
9 for this opportunity to speak tonight. My name is
10 Kathy Gere, and I'm here because I oppose what GNEP
11 is doing, for several reasons. I'm not a scientist
12 or an expert, but I have done a lot of reading by
13 scientists and other experts. And I have come to
14 my own conclusions about some of this reprocessing
15 stuff.

16 Reprocessing, for one thing,
17 economically, it just doesn't make sense. It can
18 actually increase the cost of nuclear energy by
19 80 percent. In 1996, the Academy of Sciences
20 estimated that the total cost of reprocessing and a
21 fast reactor program would cost more than
22 700 billion. This is in 2007 U.S. dollars. A
23 recent estimate by government scientists estimated
24 that it would cost 3 billion to 4.5 billion a year

1 to reprocess all of the spent fuel generated by
2 existing U.S. reactors. To me, this just doesn't
3 seem like an economical plan, especially in light
4 of all of the new technologies that we have out
5 there with alternative fuel sources. And these
6 alternative fuel sources have another benefit.
7 They're all renewable. They don't create the
8 pollution. We don't have to deal with 10,000 years
9 of radio -- radiation for future generations. So
10 if we're thinking about future generations and our
11 children, we need to consider this.

12 Other points that I wanted to bring up
13 is, reprocessing involves the separation of
14 plutonium and uranium from other nuclear spent
15 material, and this separation actually makes it
16 easier for terrorists to get ahold of, because it
17 already does part of the separation, and they don't
18 need to take as much in order to do the similar
19 kind of damage with the material.

20 I have some resources here on this, and
21 I am going to be leaving this, as far as where I
22 got this information from, and they're from things
23 like the Nuclear Information Services; Union of
24 Concerned Scientists; Radioactive Waste and the

1 Global Nuclear Energy Partnership by Robert
2 Alvarez; Carbon Free and Nuclear Free, A Roadmap
3 for U.S. Energy Policy by Dr. Arjun -- I'm not
4 going to even try it, because I will mess it up,
5 but it is written here; Radioactive Wreck: The
6 Unfolding Disasters of U.S. Irradiated Nuclear Fuel
7 Policies, the Nuclear Monitor; Assessing the
8 Benefits, Costs and Risks of Near Term Reprocessing
9 and Alternatives, by Matthew Bunn. And Matthew
10 Bunn is actually very pro nuclear energy, but he's
11 really against this reprocessing because of many of
12 the things I have already mentioned.

13 So it is not that, you know, we want to
14 say no to nuclear energy. It is this reprocessing
15 is really hazardous and dangerous, and I don't see
16 a whole lot of benefit in it, and it is going to be
17 extreme costly.

18 Thank you.

19 MR. BROWN (Facilitator): Thanks very much.

20 Mike Herzog is next. And Dr. Ivan
21 Oelrich will follow Mike.

22 If you will excuse me -- go ahead and
23 talk -- I am going to try to get the person with
24 the one-minute sign. So I will be back

1 momentarily.

2 Oh, you are here. So here is the minute
3 notice over here.

4 Okay. Mike, start right now.

5 MR. MIKE HERZOG: I'm Mike Herzog, and I'm
6 here as a federal taxpayer that is very concerned
7 about how my tax dollars may be spent. And
8 everything I have read, I think Kathy mentioned,
9 you know, the cost versus benefits analysis and the
10 risks. None of that has been documented that shows
11 that any of these programs that we see on the back
12 board have a positive cost benefit result. The
13 dollars that go into reprocessing or even to
14 current nuclear energy are always higher than the
15 plan.

16 Every plant built has cost two, three,
17 four, five times more to build than what it was
18 projected, and it takes 17 to 20 years to pay back
19 the energy consumed to build a current nuclear
20 plant, 17 to 20 years of energy production just to
21 pay back -- generate as much energy as it took to
22 build the plant. So even if the technology works,
23 we wouldn't see any climate savings or impact for
24 20 years, and the technology doesn't exist yet.

1 There is still years of research that needs to be
2 done to try to make it work. The fast breeder
3 reactors have never worked. They've always failed
4 and they've always had released radioactivity, in
5 fact, in every one that has been tried or been
6 built and operated shortly so far.

7 So that's -- I guess that's my concern.
8 I would like to see more details put into the cost
9 benefit analysis and some documentation that shows
10 that this makes financial sense in any way at all.

11 Thank you.

12 MR. BROWN (Facilitator): Thanks a lot.

13 Dr. Oelrich will be followed by George
14 Strejcek.

15 DR. IVAN OELRICH (Federation of American
16 Scientists): I'm Evan Oelrich from the Federation
17 of American Scientists, and one of the things I
18 want to make -- emphasize here, is that most of the
19 claimed benefits of reprocessing, which is a key
20 aspect of the GNEP proposal, depends on the
21 development of the so-called, and construction of a
22 whole new -- whole fleet of a new type of nuclear
23 reactor, a so-called fast neutron reactor.

24 And I say new, but, in fact, the idea of

1 fast neutron reactors goes back to the beginning of
2 the nuclear age, the end of World War II in the
3 late '40s, but across the world, we have spent
4 almost a hundred billion dollars on the research
5 and development of fast neutron reactors, but none
6 has ever been successfully commercialized.

7 The GNEP reprocessing is, and you have
8 to be clear about that, it is part of a package
9 deal. There is the reprocessing of plutonium and
10 there's the development and successful
11 commercialization of a fast neutron reactor. What
12 we're about to do with the GNEP proposal is to set
13 off here on a road that we've already set off on.
14 Over 30 years ago the United States, Britain and
15 France had plans for developing, reprocessing in
16 fast neutron reactors. Our reactor was going to be
17 the Clinch River Reactor in Clinch River,
18 Tennessee. The French built a fast neutron
19 reactor, the Phoenix, and then they built another
20 one called the Super Phoenix.

21 The British also had a program. They
22 were going to reprocess plutonium and build 8 to 12
23 fast neutron reactors. In all of these cases, the
24 fast neutron reactor program failed. We,

1 intelligently enough, cancelled the reprocessing
2 part of the program at that time for reasons that
3 who knows of. The British and the French went
4 ahead with their reprocessing programs, even though
5 they did not have the fast reactor programs
6 working. And as a result now France has an
7 inventory of almost 80 tons of plutonium, separated
8 plutonium, and Britain has an inventory of a
9 hundred tons of plutonium, and they don't really
10 have any good plans for what to do with that.

11 Concerning the cost, the plutonium is
12 going to be more expensive, because it is extracted
13 from highly radioactive fuel rods. It's going to
14 be more expensive than developing fuel from fresh
15 uranium. And that's going to be true based on
16 proven uranium reserves for at least several
17 decades, where several is probably six to seven.

18 Fast reactors are inevitably more
19 expensive than current light water reactors, and
20 since the cost of producing electricity with
21 nuclear reactors is dominated by the capital costs,
22 the electricity produced by fast reactors is going
23 to be inevitably more expensive. It will slightly,
24 if you build -- the reprocessing will slightly

1 increase the uranium, the energy available from a
2 given uranium supply but by only one-third if we
3 build the reactors and only by one-sixth if we do
4 not, you see.

5 And, finally, the DOE describes the
6 processes that they are going to use as
7 proliferation resistant, and what they mean by
8 that, it's proliferation resistant compared to the
9 process that was developed in the Manhattan
10 project, specifically for the development of
11 nuclear weapons, but it is not proliferation
12 resistant compared to what we actually do today.
13 So I don't believe the GNEP meets any of its own
14 stated goals, and it is not going to be cost
15 effective nor is it going to help protect the
16 environment.

17 Thank you very much.

18 MR. BROWN (Facilitator): Thank you.

19 George Strejcek.

20 MR. GEORGE STREJCEK (Union of Concerned
21 Scientists): Strejcek, correct.

22 MR. BROWN (Facilitator): And you may correct
23 me on pronunciation.

24 MR. STREJCEK: Strejcek.

1 Hi, how do you do. I am George
2 Strejcek. I'm a retired chemistry teacher, and I
3 represent the Union of Concerned Scientists. I
4 would like to address some matters regarding
5 safety. I notice distinguished retirees in our
6 presence tonight,
7 Dr. George Stanford. Dr. Stanford, could you
8 identify this paper as your own work?

9 DR. GEORGE STANFORD: Yes.

10 MR. STREJCEK: You did that in 2001 for an
11 organization called -- can you name the
12 organization, please.

13 DR. STANFORD: I did it and then I submitted
14 it to this organization and they chose to put it on
15 their website. And it is the National Institute --
16 you probably know the organization better than I
17 do.

18 MR. GEORGE STREJCEK: This is the National
19 Center --

20 MR. BROWN (Facilitator): George, if you can
21 speak into the mic --

22 MR. STREJCEK: Surely.

23 MR. BROWN (Facilitator): -- so both the
24 audience and Jackie can get this down.

1 MR. STREJCEK: Dr. Stanford published this in
2 December 2001. It is a publication for the
3 National Center for Public Policy Research. My
4 concern is principally safety, and nowhere in the
5 recitation that the DOE or Argonne National
6 Laboratory presented tonight was the subject of
7 plutonium or sodium addressed. In fact, IFR
8 reactors have a proven safety record that leaves
9 much to be desired. I prepared some transparencies
10 tonight, but apparently I'm living in the past, as
11 there is no overhead projector here.

12 MR. BROWN (Facilitator): You can still submit
13 it.

14 MR. STREJCEK: Okay. September 30, 1999,
15 Tokai, Japan, in the criticality accident, a
16 self-sustained chain reaction continues for
17 20 hours before it could be stopped. Six Japanese
18 scientists plead guilty to negligence. Two deaths
19 outright, 68 received sub-lethal doses of
20 radiation, 667 people exposed.

21 December 8, 1995, Monju sodium leak and
22 fire. Serious reactor accident involved spillage
23 of 100 kilograms of sodium. The sodium caught
24 fire. Cover-up was revealed. There was an

1 eight-minute videotape you can watch tonight if you
2 go home. It's on You Tube. The chief engineer
3 committed suicide.

4 The worst fact -- worst fast reactor
5 accident took place in 1959 in Simi Valley,
6 California. You might call this the wild west days
7 of the nuclear agency in this country. There was a
8 serious sodium fire and an experimental IFR
9 facility in Simi Valley, California. This was not
10 revealed until 1979. How much radiation was
11 released? About 400 times more radiation was
12 released than during the Three Mile accident --
13 Three Mile Island accident in 1979.

14 I'd like to talk a little bit about this
15 Monju nuclear accident. I think this is
16 significant. This address is not --

17 MR. BROWN (Facilitator): Sorry.

18 MR. STREJCEK: Oh, pardon me.

19 MR. BROWN (Facilitator): Jackie is having
20 trouble following you.

21 MR. STREJCEK: Okay.

22 Monju Nuclear Power Plant, Monju is
23 Japan's first fast breeder reactor or faster
24 reactor located in Tsuruga, Fukui Prefecture in

1 Japan. The reactor began construction in 1985 and
2 first achieved criticality in April 1994. This
3 date is important. Monju is a sodium cooled
4 MOX-fueled loop type reactor with three primary
5 coolant loops producing 700 megawatts of power.
6 Monju was closed in 1995 following a serious sodium
7 leak and is expected to reopen in 2008. What is
8 interesting about this, the construction started in
9 1983. The commercial operation started in August,
10 August 29, 1995, and the reactor basically shut
11 down due to this sodium fire three months later in
12 December of 1995.

13 I addressed Dr. Stanford's paper,
14 National Policy Analysis from an organization that
15 printed it, the National Center for Public Policy
16 Research. I'd like to tell you a little bit about
17 this outfit. It's located in Washington, D.C.
18 This is their official policy. Environmental
19 policy, firm in the belief that private owners are
20 the best stewards of the environment, the National
21 Center for Environmental and Regulatory Affairs
22 advocates private, free market solutions to today's
23 environmental challenges. The task force
24 highlights the, I quote, perverse nature of many

1 government firsts in environmental policies through
2 the collection and promotion of regulatory horror
3 stories which attach human faces to very real
4 problems caused by regulation, the old bugaboo
5 regulation. I submit that football would be a much
6 more interesting game if we eliminated referees
7 completely.

8 Okay. Cost. This was addressed earlier
9 by several people --

10 MR. BROWN (Facilitator): You've got a little
11 less than a minute left if you can --

12 MR. STREJCEK: Sure. Clinch River fast
13 reactor, the initial cost estimate in 1971 was
14 \$257 million. Factoring in cost overruns in 1970,
15 it was to cost no more than \$400 million. By 1981,
16 \$1 billion had been spent on the Clinch River fast
17 reactor. The project was cancelled in 1983. The
18 general accounting office estimated 8 billion had
19 been spent by the time this project was finally
20 cancelled.

21 The government, and these gentlemen
22 won't inform you of the fact that there is a plan
23 in effect to build 46 of these plutonium recycled
24 reactors. The cost would be, I would imagine,

1 something on the order of 500 to \$600 billion if
2 this program was fully implemented. I submit that
3 in current times that we live in, with the economy
4 in the tank, we cannot afford such a profligate
5 program at this time.

6 Thank you so much for your time.

7 MR. BROWN (Facilitator): Thanks very much.

8 George got to the podium so quick I
9 wasn't able to announce the next speaker. Linda
10 Lewiston, are you here? Are you ready to speak?

11 MS. LINDA LEWISTON (NEIS): I'm ready.

12 MR. BROWN (Facilitator): Linda will be
13 followed by Rita Maniotis.

14 MS. LEWISTON: Hello. Good evening. I am
15 here representing Dave Kraft and the Nuclear Energy
16 Information Service, of which I am a board member.
17 The NEIS has been an energy watchdog group in
18 Illinois for the last 27 years. I want to say that
19 we oppose GNEP and the reprocessing solution for
20 the reasons that have been stated by Kathy Gere,
21 Dr. Oelrich and others tonight, so I'm not going to
22 repeat them. But I do want to say that NEIS stands
23 behind the preferred solution, which is to keep the
24 radioactive material on site in the special

1 hardened, on-site storage containers scattering
2 them on site, putting them at partly, if not
3 wholly, underground, berming them and protecting
4 them as best they can for all the reasons that were
5 already discussed.

6 This solution, while it's not as, you
7 know, interesting as reprocessing with all the buzz
8 around it, all the bells and whistles, it is the
9 solution that has been endorsed by the Radioactive
10 Waste Conference that was held last summer in
11 August by all of the radioactive waste experts.

12 I also want to mention that Dr. Oelrich
13 is going to be featured on WBEZ tomorrow, World
14 View at 9 o'clock in the evening and at 12:00 noon,
15 and there is a table of materials in the back with
16 some information of some other views than the ones
17 that were presented here tonight. And you can
18 access much more material on the subject by going
19 to the NEIS website, www.NEIS.org.

20 Thank you very much.

21 MR. BROWN (Facilitator): Thanks, Linda.

22 Rita Maniotis, and she'll be followed by
23 Sydney Balman.

24 MS. SYDNEY BAIMAN: Baiman.

1 MR. BROWN (Facilitator): Baiman?

2 MS. BAIMAN: Yeah.

3 MR. BROWN (Facilitator): Okay.

4 MS. RITA MANIOTIS (West Side Greens): Hi, my
5 name is Rita Maniotis. I'm a member of the West
6 Side Greens. I'm also a volunteer with the Chicago
7 Independent Media Center, and I'm a resident of
8 Berwyn, a teacher, and I have three children.

9 I produce a monthly radio program for
10 Chicago Independent Media Center. And for a recent
11 program, we went to the only known nuclear waste
12 dump that's open to the public in the forest
13 preserve not too far from here. It's an eerie
14 site. There's a boulder that says in English,
15 "don't dig here." There was also contamination of
16 the water in that area because of that waste dump.

17 This is the remnants of the start of the
18 nuclear age. Nuclear power is one of the several
19 scientific ventures that I feel threatens the very
20 existence of the human race. Reprocessing of
21 nuclear fuel has proven to contaminate the
22 surrounding environment so much as to be
23 uninhabitable and to spew contamination far beyond
24 the reprocessing plant as shown in Ireland.

1 To site a plant near the third largest
2 metropolitan area, which has been mentioned in the
3 United States, is not only insane, I think it's
4 criminal. And I know that they're talking about no
5 sites tonight, but it has been mentioned that
6 Morris and near Argonne would be the two places.
7 Radioactivity is not compatible with biological
8 life forms, and a reprocessing plant could
9 devastate this area, which is critical to the
10 health of the entire region. The Great Lakes
11 nearby, as well as the Des Plaines River that
12 empties into the Mississippi River are responsible
13 for the water that nourishes the farmland, people
14 and animals that reside here. If there's any
15 chance of contaminating this area, I think it's
16 just crazy.

17 And, actually, when I was in second
18 grade, they brought in a speaker to sell us on
19 nuclear power, how wonderful it was going to be,
20 too cheap to meter, no problems with it. And it's
21 just -- it's like, to me, this reprocessing thing
22 is like the Cat in the Hat Comes Back. You know
23 the guy's no good. He comes back and he says --
24 when the Cat in the Hat comes back, he says,

1 "There's a spot." You know, he makes a spot in the
2 house and then he's trying to get rid of it, and
3 pretty soon, the entire environment is
4 contaminated. That's all I can think of when I
5 think of reprocessing.

6 Nuclear reprocessing is also billed as a
7 solution to nuclear waste spots and promises only
8 to magnify an already grave problem, not minimize
9 it. We cannot start a project hoping for some
10 magical little Cat Z to eventually clean up the
11 whole mess. I fear that a nuclear fuel
12 reprocessing plant will leave a much larger waste
13 dump than the one in the forest preserve. I
14 picture a future behemoth of a waste dump, scores
15 of miles in circumference that is off limits to
16 people in the heart of the Midwest and generations
17 from now I believe people will -- are going to
18 curse their ancestors and wonder how we could have
19 pursued such misguided, irresponsible and
20 cataclysmic policies.

21 Thank you very much.

22 MR. BROWN (Facilitator): Thank you.

23 The next speaker is Sydney Baiman.

24 MS. SYDNEY BAIMAN: I am Sydney Baiman. It's

1 B-a-i-m-a-n.

2 MR. BROWN (Facilitator): Thank you.

3 MS. BAIMAN: I just wanted to mention, along
4 with the doctor here that talked about Japan,
5 there's a book out called, We almost lost Detroit.
6 It was in 1962, I think, they built a breeder
7 reactor. It's called Fermi 1. And it almost had
8 a -- almost exploded. And for one month in the
9 book, people were tiptoeing around the reactor just
10 praying, for God's sakes. So I think that's one of
11 the reasons why we didn't get breeder reactors from
12 this experience and there's a whole book, you can
13 get it, called, We Almost Lost Detroit. And that
14 was involved with the breeder reactor.

15 The Union of Concerned Scientists said
16 that reprocessing is dangerous, dirty and
17 expensive. The reprocessing program would add to
18 the worldwide stockpile of separated and vulnerable
19 plutonium that sits in storage today at the end of
20 2005, tolling 250 metric tons. Plutonium is an
21 extremely potent cancer-producing material,
22 appropriately named after Pluto, the God of Hell.
23 It has a half-life of 24,400 years, and if you go
24 through all the half-lives, it lasts for about a

1 million years, half, half, half, half, half.

2 The Global Nuclear Energy Partnership
3 represents a reversal of 30 years of U.S. nuclear
4 policy, which has consistently opposed commercial
5 reprocessing, thanks to President Carter, who in
6 his early 20s worked as a jumper to clean up the
7 1952 Chalk River reactor accident in Canada. So he
8 knew a lot about the nuclear industry and he had a
9 solar energy, what do you call it, on his roof.
10 And thanks to him, we never got reprocessing.

11 When I see all the problems in Europe
12 with reprocessing, from Sellafield, which
13 discharges over a thousand -- do you know where
14 Sellafield is? Up in Cumbria, northeast India. It
15 has been discharging over a thousand times more
16 radiation into air, water and land than their
17 neighbor sister plant in Kojima, in France.

18 In the U.S., three military processing
19 plants, Hanford Plant in Richmond, Washington; the
20 Getty Oil Plants in West Valley, New York; the
21 Allied Chemical Plant on the Savannah River in
22 Barnwell, South Carolina, no longer operate. I
23 wonder why.

24 Well, from shoddy construction, the

1 other Hanford facility has created 250,000 cubic
2 meters of high level radioactive liquid waste. You
3 get tons and tanks and tanks of liquid waste and
4 you also get tons and tons of sludge, contaminated
5 sludge with reprocessing. You increase the whole
6 process, you increase the whole waste process, at
7 least 150 times. Helen Coldercott said 170 times.

8 There have been dozens of significant
9 leaks into -- all right. The Columbia River
10 contaminated -- the aquifers around Columbia River
11 have been contaminated from all the tanks there.
12 So we're talking about the survival of our planet
13 when we're talking about this reprocessing, which
14 is the most dirtiest part of the whole carcinogenic
15 nuclear chain.

16 What we put into our environment comes
17 back to us. Now, the seas are so contaminated now,
18 because everything has been dumped into the seas.
19 We just throw stuff into the sea. And there's a
20 famous sea activist, the Frenchman, Michelle
21 Jacques Cousteau, and he says there are, at the end
22 of the rivers, where the rivers go into the seas,
23 there are 50 dead zones. In the mouths of rivers
24 where they enter the oceans, the mouths in the

1 Mississippi, the dead zone is as big as the State
2 of Pennsylvania. So, certainly, nuclear power is
3 contributing to these dead zones all over the
4 world. So we want to preserve our seas, which have
5 become -- which are dumping ground, especially for
6 nuclear power.

7 You get the dump -- the stuff gets
8 dumped from -- it'll get back to Braidwood. This
9 gets back to the Illinois state. Braidwood Nuclear
10 Power generated tritium, a radioactive isotope of
11 hydrogen that can replace nonradioactive hydrogen.
12 At Braidwood, dozens of tritium leaks and spills
13 hidden from the public for more than a decade have
14 contaminated area groundwater and seeped into
15 private wells.

16 Chicago Attorney General Lisa Madigan
17 and State Attorney James Glasgow have filed a
18 lawsuit against the owner and operators of the
19 Braidwood Nuclear Generating Station in Will County
20 for releases of waste water containing tritium into
21 the groundwater beneath the plant and outside the
22 boundary of Braidwood. According to the suit,
23 Exelon has released tritiated water at eight
24 separate locations. And I can go on and on, but

1 the main thing is that there's a river, Kankakee,
2 for four and a half miles, and there's an
3 underground pipe, and one pipe is clean water and
4 one pipe -- one side of the pipe is clean, one side
5 is dirty and they get the valves all mixed up, so
6 the dirty water goes into the ground and the clean
7 water goes into the river. This happens all the
8 time.

9 So there are 40 -- I was down there in
10 Godley with the people from their 48 contaminated
11 wells. People in Godley and Braidwood cannot use
12 their drinking water; they cannot use their wells.
13 They are totally contaminated with tritiated water.

14 It was on -- it was on, what do you call
15 it, Chicago Tonight, but they didn't do a very good
16 job. This shows that Commonwealth Edison and the
17 parent company as of 2000, Exelon, in 1996, an
18 estimated -- the biggest leak was in 1996, an
19 estimated 40,000-gallon release of tritiated water
20 entered the surrounding ditch and remains in
21 groundwater, and, of course, a lot of that gets
22 into the river and, guess what, it gets into the
23 ocean.

24 MR. BROWN (Facilitator): If you can just make

1 the final point.

2 MS. BAIMAN: Sure, any day. The only thing
3 reactor owners can be trusted to do is lie.
4 Nuclear power reactors do not emit -- I just heard
5 you say they don't emit any pollution. How can you
6 see that? They're burping all the time, releases
7 all the time. What do you call radiation? That's
8 not pollution? We're breathing it. Cancer rates
9 have gone up. Cancer rates have gone up around --
10 when Clinton was shut for four years, the Clinton
11 reactor here was shut in 1990, I forget the four
12 years, 1996. All the cancer rates went down, all
13 the breast cancer, all the mortality, infant rates
14 went down. When you shut the plants down, all the
15 cancer rates go down.

16 Here is a map of the U.S. and you see
17 where the reactors are. The dark shading shows a
18 marked increase in cancer. That's where the
19 reactors are. I am sorry. And where it's white
20 out west, you have a decrease in all these
21 sicknesses that nuclear power generates. And this
22 is Clinton reactor, and here you see how it went
23 down all -- everything went down when the reactor
24 was shut.

1 MR. BROWN (Facilitator): If you can submit
2 those for the record, we would appreciate it.

3 MS. BAIMAN: Okay. Thank you.

4 MR. BROWN (Facilitator): Okay. Thanks very
5 much.

6 Gail Snyder is next and she'll be
7 followed by Nancy Ammer.

8 MS. GAIL SNYDER: Good evening, and thank you
9 for this opportunity to speak. I am from earth,
10 and I am a member of the human race, like many of
11 you. I am a citizen of the United States. I am a
12 resident of a state with the most nuclear waste,
13 with the most nuclear reactors, potential site of a
14 nuclear reprocessing facility. Welcome to
15 Illinois.

16 During the presentation, I heard that
17 the public comment section will be potentially
18 extended, not tonight, but they had it, I think in
19 November and December and they are looking at
20 extending the period. And I just wanted to say, I
21 really think it needs to be promoted better.

22 I think if tonight is any representation
23 of the kind of promotion that the Department of
24 Energy is putting out for this event, it's rather

1 sad. Tonight, you know, we don't have maybe a
2 hundred people in here tonight in a region that is
3 populated, and, as I said, really consumed by
4 nuclear energy. Why is this? Is it because people
5 aren't interested? No. I don't believe so. I
6 think it's because people do not know this is going
7 on. People are unaware.

8 When I say to people we have the most
9 nuclear waste, we have the most nuclear reactors,
10 they give me a blank stare. They have no idea what
11 I'm talking about, let alone mention GNEP. I've
12 mentioned GNEP to my elected officials. They don't
13 know what I'm talking about. I've tried to launch
14 an effort to let them know what's going on in my --
15 in our community, in our region. People are not
16 aware of what's going on and that's why we have
17 this poor showing tonight. And if this public
18 comment section is extended, it really needs to be
19 promoted.

20 If GNEP is finally approved and sited,
21 how are elected officials going to justify to the
22 public why nuclear waste is being shipped on
23 railways and roadways through their community? The
24 residents of communities are going to be just

1 completely upset. They are going to wonder why
2 didn't they hear about this. Why didn't the press
3 cover this? Where were the big articles? Why
4 weren't there representatives e-mailed? Why
5 weren't they on an e-mail list being notified
6 continuously of these things? Why wasn't there a
7 real public education effort? Clean, clean, clean,
8 nuclear energy and reprocessing is clean. No. No,
9 it's not. Processing uranium, mining it, getting
10 it ready for the nuclear reactor is not a clean
11 process. There are many serious by-products that
12 go into our air from that process, and
13 radioactivity is not clean. Really. Radioactivity
14 is not clean energy.

15 This is deceptive. This is really
16 deceptive to say to people and promote that nuclear
17 energy or reprocessing is clean. Radioactivity is
18 not clean. I think it's a really poor practice to
19 keep promoting it this way.

20 Leaving radiation out of the definition
21 of what clean energy is, is deceptive. Finally, I
22 am against reprocessing and GNEP. It's my belief
23 that if more citizens in Illinois were aware of our
24 situation here, they would be against it, too.

1 Thank you.

2 MR. BROWN (Facilitator): Thanks very much.

3 Nancy Ammer. Again, I need help with
4 the pronunciation. Shari Katz will follow Nancy.

5 MS. NANCY AMMER (Grundy Economic Development):
6 Thank you. I'd like to say thank you to the
7 Department of Energy for having this meeting
8 tonight and all of you for being here. I'm Nancy
9 Ammer and I'm with the Grundy Economic Development
10 Council that's located in Morris, Illinois.

11 Grundy County finds itself at the center
12 of nuclear activity in Illinois with three nuclear
13 plants within 30 miles; Dresden, Braidwood and
14 LaSalle Station. In addition, the GE's spent fuel
15 storage facility is also located in Morris, which
16 was discussed earlier. The Dresden facility first
17 came on line in the mid '60s and has received a
18 license extension until 2031. The facilities in
19 Grundy County have operated safely for nearly
20 40 years.

21 On an annual basis, the three generating
22 facilities employed nearly 2,000 people. They pay
23 our local schools, fire departments and other
24 districts nearly 50 million per year in tax

1 revenue. The employees at these facilities are our
2 neighbors. They're Little League coaches, local
3 officials and community volunteers. They're
4 professional, hard working people that take great
5 pride in operating safe and efficient generating
6 stations. The high skilled positions are welcome
7 opportunities to our local residents.

8 Illinois generates nearly 50 percent of
9 its power from nuclear energy. That's compared to
10 the national average of approximately 19 to
11 20 percent. The time is now to have a
12 comprehensive energy policy that addresses the
13 important role of nuclear energy in our state and
14 country. And we need a strategy to deal with the
15 spent nuclear fuel, much of which is found in
16 Grundy County. Doing nothing is not an acceptable
17 strategy.

18 I commend the Department of Energy for
19 investigating closing the fuel cycle and encourage
20 them to continue to research safe, environmentally
21 responsible and real viable solutions.

22 Thank you.

23 MR. BROWN (Facilitator): Thank you.

24 Shari Katz. And Abby Strasser will be

1 next.

2 MS. SHARI KATZ: Thank you for the opportunity
3 to let the public speak tonight and for holding
4 these kinds of hearings, and I would echo the other
5 woman's comment about lack of awareness of the
6 activity happening. You know, I happen to be very
7 concerned about the environment, and so I subscribe
8 to a variety of organizations that would make me
9 aware of this, but there are a lot of people who
10 are ignorant to it, that don't know what GNEP is,
11 don't recognize all of the risks that's going on.
12 And so I think just from an informational
13 standpoint, we're spending a lot of taxpayers
14 dollars to pay for all of your salaries to do all
15 of this great research and create this two-inch
16 thick binder. You know, as part of that, spend a
17 little bit of money to let us all know that this is
18 going on in a more broader sense. I think that's
19 only fair. We are already making a significant
20 investment in doing all this work to start. So
21 what's an additional, you know, chunk of change to
22 educate the rest of us.

23 I'm a mother of a one-year-old, and I
24 continue to think about what kind of world I'm

1 leaving behind for him and what kind of things he's
2 being exposed to on a daily basis from what we've
3 done to disrespect our environment, disrespect what
4 God has created for us. And, you know, I am also a
5 taxpayer who is very frugal with my spending and
6 think that, you know, people should be thinking
7 about how they are spending our taxpayer dollars
8 when, you know, I'm giving 20, 30 percent of my
9 income that I work really darn hard for. I would
10 expect that that money would be taken care of in a
11 way that is very thoughtful. And it is concerning
12 to me, you know, that this reprocessing is very
13 expensive and that it does take a really long time
14 to create these plans, and that, you know, there is
15 a history of these things not functioning very well
16 so why can't we take that money and invest it in a
17 way that is a more sure thing, working on things
18 like wind and solar, and even looking at other
19 alternatives with other options we have out there.

20 In general, I just disagree with the
21 expansion of nuclear energy and reprocessing is
22 really taking us towards the path of doing that,
23 and I think if a lot of other people were aware of
24 this, they would probably have similar concerns

1 that I do. I also am concerned that we potentially
2 could become a dumping ground for other people's
3 nuclear waste and they all send it here and
4 reprocess it here. And I personally don't want
5 that done in my backyard.

6 And, you know, I am not a scientist. I
7 am just a general college-educated person out
8 there, you know, trying to make a living and raise
9 my family, but I hear, you know, just transporting
10 that stuff, whether it's coming on your highway or
11 your trains going through your downtowns, you know,
12 we all -- here in Chicago, we have all these trains
13 that go through our cities. You know, what if
14 something happens to that waste that's transporting
15 around?

16 Our local towns don't know what the heck
17 to do with a nuclear spill. They can barely handle
18 if a chemical spill happens on the Burlington
19 Northern in my town, let alone, you know, potential
20 hazards. If something happens on the highway, you
21 could be 10, 15, 20 miles from it and your home
22 could still be impacted from it. This is lethal,
23 awful stuff. I don't know what the heck people
24 were thinking when we got into doing nuclear power

1 and energy and the bomb in the first place. I
2 think it was just a really sad decision on our
3 part. And I don't think any amount of radiation is
4 okay. Just like, you know, I don't think it's okay
5 to put a little bit of arsenic in my dinner,
6 either.

7 So thank you for your time.

8 MR. BROWN (Facilitator): Thank you.

9 Abby is next, and she'll be followed by
10 George Stanford.

11 MS. ABBY STRASSER: Hi, my name is Abby
12 Strasser, and I have been listening to all of the
13 other types of hearing that our government has been
14 having. I think nuclear power is a subprime energy
15 alternative, and I am sick as a taxpayer bailing
16 out big corporations that make big disasters that
17 we end up subsidizing again. Investing tax dollars
18 in nuclear power would be economically
19 irresponsible. We would be denying future
20 generations the ability to invest in safer, more
21 efficient energy technology. Due to the
22 Price-Anderson Act, which requires the cost of
23 decommissioning and accidents and other liabilities
24 to be paid by us, the taxpayers.

1 Again, nuclear waste remains dangerously
2 radioactive for thousands of years, accruing
3 containment costs for generations, upon
4 generations. The estimated cost to build one power
5 plant I've seen are from 2 to \$12 billion and that
6 uranium prices are rising. In comparison, the RTA
7 of Illinois, a hearing I also went to, could be
8 funded for five years for
9 \$10 billion, resulting in less cars on the road and
10 more freedom for lower income individuals commuting
11 to jobs, school and services. So when we spend a
12 dollar on nuclear, we're not spending it on
13 something else better. We ought to consider that.

14 Nuclear power does have negative health
15 effects on those exposed to leaked radioactive
16 substances such as tritium, ionized radiation,
17 uranium tailings and uranium dust. Wind and solar
18 powered generators would not produce such
19 by-products. Again, which do we want to choose?
20 Nuclear power companies are facing growing
21 resistance from indigenous peoples around the world
22 who are negatively affected by uranium mining,
23 nuclear testing and nuclear dumping. Cancer rates
24 and birth effects are higher in these populations

1 than those not located near nuclear facilities or
2 uranium mines. Again, we are targeting vulnerable
3 populations to pay the price of nuclear power.

4 Nuclear power consolidates control of
5 the world's energy into a few corporations, while
6 wind and solar power can be generated and sold by
7 more smaller, independent entities, even
8 individuals living off the grid. More supporting
9 jobs would be created and tax dollars more evenly
10 distributed throughout states and nations. Again,
11 we have more local control over energy and the
12 local energy decisions.

13 Components for wind and solar can be
14 produced in the United States, while components for
15 nuclear power plants, at least some of them, need
16 to be imported and slow down construction times.
17 Let's keep the jobs in America and let's produce
18 the wind turbines ourselves. Why would we import
19 this technology from other countries.

20 Nuclear power advocates have proposed
21 transporting nuclear waste across state lines
22 requiring expenditures of fossil fuels and
23 emissions of CO-2 and putting many communities en
24 route in danger. Again, we're using fossil fuels

1 so we're not totally new alternative. We're still
2 using fossil fuels to contribute to nuclear power.
3 We wouldn't have to do that with wind or solar.

4 Nuclear power can be developed fast
5 enough -- cannot be developed fast enough, nor safe
6 enough, nor cheap enough to significantly replace
7 fossil fuels and reduce carbon emissions enough to
8 slow down global warming. So, again, it would not
9 help with global warming.

10 In conclusion, these plants will be
11 obsolete before they are even built and will
12 prevent future generations from spending money on
13 better alternatives, such as wind and solar.
14 Chances are, neither your children or mine will
15 ever own a nuclear power plant, but they might be
16 able to drive an electric car, heat their home with
17 solar panels, be part of a wind power cooperative,
18 sell solar panels, market biofuels grown on local
19 farms, et cetera. Parents can use this money they
20 save on heating their home to send their children
21 to college, to take a tour to see a growing
22 population of polar bears, to live healthier lives.
23 Wouldn't that be a better scenario than giving our
24 dwindling tax dollars to big corporations more

1 interested in short-term profit than our long-term
2 survival?

3 Thank you.

4 MR. BROWN (Facilitator): Thank you.

5 George Stanford is next, and he will be
6 followed by April Gerstung.

7 MR. GEORGE STANFORD: Well, now for something
8 a little different. It's a very big topic, and I
9 am going to just work -- talk about one small
10 aspect of it, and, that is, that we need -- in
11 thinking about nuclear power, we need to think
12 globally. All the comments today have been, shall
13 we say, locally oriented, and isolationism is
14 obsolete, and here is the global situation in a
15 nutshell. Nuclear reactors are becoming more and
16 more used around the world. More nuclear power
17 plants are being proposed, planned and built.
18 There now are 439 reactors operating in the world.
19 There are 30 under construction. There are 106
20 planned or on order and 270 proposed.

21 Now, all of these numbers are quite a
22 bit bigger than they were a year ago. On the
23 average, almost five nuclear reactors have been
24 proposed around the world every month for the past

1 two years, and the pace is accelerating. Now, how
2 does the GNEP fit into this?

3 As you've heard already, it's a
4 two-pronged proposal to deal with two major
5 problems. One of them is a nuclear waste problem.
6 At the 439 plants now operating, used fuel, which
7 is often incorrectly called waste, keeps
8 accumulating in temporary storage. This raises
9 concerns about safety, long-term management and the
10 possibility of malicious use.

11 The other problem is this, the growing
12 demand around the world for reactor fuel increases
13 the need for two types of facilities; facilities to
14 enrich uranium and to reprocess the spent fuel.
15 Now, the fact is that other countries around the
16 world are going to need to enrich uranium and/or
17 reprocess fuel. They're going to need to have
18 access to that sort of material to meet their
19 energy needs.

20 Now, the problem is that those
21 facilities can be subverted to produce bomb grade
22 uranium and plutonium. The enrichment facilities
23 make -- can be used to make bomb-grade uranium, and
24 the reprocessing facilities can be used to make

1 bomb-grade plutonium. So this raises serious
2 proliferation concerns.

3 Now, as we've heard already, the GNEP
4 would address those. First, it would develop and
5 implement a technology for recycling the used fuel.
6 That would get much more energy out of that fuel
7 while actually destroying the troublesome
8 long-lived components that are now in what is
9 called the waste. That reduces the needed
10 isolation time for the waste to 400 years instead
11 of 10,000, and safe storage for 400 years is a very
12 interesting -- easy, a very easy job. By the way,
13 what people -- not many know, is that the reactors
14 running today only use 5 percent of the energy in
15 their fuel and less than a hundredths part of the
16 original -- of the energy in the original ore.
17 Reactors can get a hundred times as much energy out
18 of the mined uranium as is being done now.

19 What will happen now if the GNEP is
20 rejected? Well, that would be very bad for
21 nonproliferation, because many more countries would
22 feel the need to get one or both types of those
23 facilities. Under GNEP, as you recall, we heard
24 earlier, the facilities would be confined to those

1 states that already have nuclear weapons, so they
2 would not constitute a proliferation danger.
3 Without U.S. leadership, U.S. is about the only
4 country in the world, the only country in the world
5 with the influence to take the lead in creating the
6 international organization that would be needed for
7 a proper management of the growing nuclear
8 industry. Without GNEP or something equivalent, it
9 will be every nation for itself in the nuclear
10 weapons business.

11 MR. BROWN (Facilitator): Thank you very much.

12 April Gerstung. And Frank Barber will
13 be after April.

14 MS. APRIL GERSTUNG: Following the doctor is
15 like following cute kids and cute puppies for me.
16 My name is April Gerstung. I live in Morris,
17 Illinois. Quote, "Science is organized common
18 sense where many a beautiful theory was killed by
19 an ugly fact." The proposed Global Nuclear Energy
20 Partnership promoted by the current Bush
21 Administration as a way to solve the nuclear waste
22 problem in the U.S. and to support the expansion of
23 nuclear energy brings into question, does
24 reprocessing require disposal and permanent storage

1 of radioactive waste and does it not produce other
2 radioactive matter that remain hazardous for
3 thousand of years, or is that an ugly fact?

4 Does reprocessing increase the risk of
5 nuclear terrorism due to the separation of the
6 materials and increase the risk of theft from a
7 reprocessing facility, a storage facility and
8 transport vehicles?

9 Does it make a community vulnerable to
10 potential attacks by air, or is that an ugly fact?

11 Does reprocessing increase the case of
12 nuclear proliferation by making it more difficult
13 for inspectors to make precise measurements of the
14 weapon-usable materials during and after
15 processing, or is that an ugly fact?

16 Does reprocessing estimated monetary
17 expense in the billions of dollars become yet
18 another burden on the American public through
19 increased taxes or higher electricity bills, or is
20 that an ugly fact?

21 Does the reprocessing technology have to
22 be so complicated and difficult that we common
23 citizens have a difficulty in making an educated
24 decision as to an open or closed fuel cycle, or is

1 that an ugly fact?

2 Quote, "Common sense is the knack of
3 seeing things as they are and doing things as they
4 ought to be done," end quote.

5 My home is within a 25-mile radius of
6 three nuclear power plants, a high level waste
7 storage and nuclear laundry facility. The three
8 plants, with six active reactors and one inactive
9 reactor have operated a combined number that totals
10 163 years and have collectively generated
11 approximately 4,004 MTUs. The General Electric
12 facility located across from one of the nuclear
13 generating plants and also the designated site for
14 the considered reprocessing facility directly lays
15 on an earthquake fault and stores an estimated 710
16 MTUs.

17 The Department of Energy states in the
18 PEIS summary, that all the alternatives suggested
19 for reprocessing could affect public health through
20 the release of radiological materials to the
21 environment, and it further states that release of
22 radioactive material into the environment to the
23 population within a 50-mile radius of a spent fuel
24 recycling facility would generally cause the

1 highest dose. Our communities hosting these three
2 nuclear power plants and other nuclear facilities
3 provide an unprecedented and unique opportunity for
4 the Department of Energy and other agencies that
5 analyze and regulate radiological releases of
6 routine operations from these facilities to study
7 the combined cumulative synergistic effects with
8 other environmental contaminants that are also
9 present and to consider the addition of further
10 facilities that emit radioactivity.

11 Our communities in this area are already
12 requesting independent epidemiologists to study the
13 existing and documented health data that shows an
14 unusually high number of unexplained illnesses and
15 the unusually high rate of cancer in not only
16 adults but with our children. And we implore you
17 to find that exposing any individuals to any
18 increased risk of contracting a fatal cancer is
19 unacceptable.

20 Quote, "Common sense is not so common,"
21 end quote. We need more common sense when
22 considering human health, whether a closed or open
23 fuel cycle.

24 To be honest, becoming comfortable in

1 understanding General Electric's proposed
2 technology took some time and, consequently, the
3 six additional programmatic alternatives profiled
4 would require more time and tutorial materials than
5 are within my means. It's simply too confusing for
6 me.

7 Make no mistake, I believe that we have
8 a radioactive waste problem in this country, and it
9 needs to be solved. In choosing the closed fuel
10 cycle, we have nothing solid and safe to base a
11 decision on, as reprocessing facility projects have
12 not been successful. The open fuel cycle being
13 presently utilized may not be such a bad practice
14 for the time being. Personally, I would prefer
15 that researchers and scientists develop a reactor
16 that could be commercially viable, that operated
17 from something other than what is currently relied
18 on, so there would be no need to reprocess, and we
19 who share our environment and our lives with
20 nuclear facilities no longer have to worry about
21 the effluents emitted.

22 Common sense also tells me that maybe we
23 need to stop creating more waste, and one of the
24 ways could be that the Department of Energy stop

1 offering loan guarantees for nuclear power plant
2 construction until together the industry, the
3 scientists, the governmental agencies and the
4 public reach a solution that is acceptable to and
5 for all.

6 Quote, "Common sense is genius dressed
7 in its working clothes," end quote. It's time for
8 us all to put on our working clothes.

9 MR. BROWN (Facilitator): Thank you.

10 Frank Barber and James Foster will be
11 next.

12 MR. FRANK BARBER: I'm Frank Barber. I'm from
13 Morris, Illinois, Grundy County, the location of
14 one of the sites that was being considered for a
15 reprocessing facility for spent nuclear fuel by the
16 Department of Energy. Had common sense been used,
17 Grundy County would never have been considered.

18 First, I'd like to thank all of the
19 people who wrote responses to the DOE and let them
20 know what you thought about GNEP. The people got
21 their attention. GNEP was supposed to get rid of
22 spent nuclear fuel and stop nuclear proliferation.
23 It would do neither. It would create more nuclear
24 waste and would not stop nuclear proliferation when

1 there are corporations and countries willing to
2 sell reactors, fuel and technology to who -- anyone
3 who has the money to pay for it. Yes, we need a
4 way to get rid of spent fuel, and I would suggest
5 that one of the ways is to make -- to make that a
6 possibility would be to take at least 25 percent of
7 the profits from the nuclear power companies, put
8 it in a fund to start a Manhattan type project that
9 would figure out how to stop emissions from nuke
10 plants and how to safely get rid of the radioactive
11 waste and not create any more.

12 The original Manhattan project was only
13 to figure out how to make a large bomb. They
14 succeeded. Then they came up with Atoms for Peace,
15 and everything that they have touched has
16 contaminated the air, soil and water, and a few
17 corporations have made billions of dollars and have
18 been irresponsible. The federal government has
19 also been irresponsible in the manufacturing of
20 nuclear weapons and regulating the nuclear
21 industry. The nuclear industry, the federal
22 government and the public have been sitting on
23 their rear ends for many years doing nothing and
24 letting the problems keep growing, compounding, and

1 letting a few corporations make obscene profits.

2 Let Exelon and the other power companies
3 clean up their own mess. The taxpayers have been
4 bled to death while the energy companies make
5 billions in profit. Since the federal government
6 supposedly took possession of all the spent fuel,
7 the energy companies have had a free pass and no
8 worries about the spent fuel. They think, let the
9 taxpayers take care of it.

10 We have had enough. No more nuke plants
11 should be built until the emissions are stopped and
12 the spent fuel problems are solved. Nuclear power
13 and reprocessing or the spent fuel that is created
14 is not clean and green. It is dirty, dangerous and
15 deadly. I just read the GNEP PEIS summary. This
16 should be required reading for every American
17 citizen. All of the alternatives listed in this
18 summary are very hazardous and experimental. To be
19 honest, after reading this summary, I got sick to
20 my stomach because of all the dangers associated
21 with a closed fuel cycle.

22 At this time, I am 100 percent against
23 reclaiming, recycling reprocessing or a closed fuel
24 cycle. It is about time that the DOE, NRC and the

1 federal government stop beating a dead horse and
2 stop pouring hard earned taxpayer money down a rat
3 hole and put their efforts and finances behind
4 renewable energy sources, wind, solar, geothermal,
5 hydro. Let nuclear power die. (Applause)

6 MR. BROWN (Facilitator): James Foster and
7 Tammy Thompson will follow James.

8 MR. JAMES FOSTER (Retired NRC): Hi, I'm James
9 Foster, and I'm a retired Nuclear Regulatory
10 Commission inspector. As such, I may have a
11 slightly different view on some items that have
12 been previously discussed. I have inspected the
13 facilities in Illinois and Indiana. I have been to
14 uranium ore processing and enrichment facilities.
15 I have been to nuclear waste disposal locations.
16 This has been my livelihood for some 26 years. I
17 left them in 2003. I'm not here as a
18 representative of the agency but on my own.

19 First, I think this meeting was called
20 to obtain comments on your own environmental
21 statement. I'd like to make that. And directly
22 back on your boards you have discussion of a number
23 of different fuel cycles. In this country, we
24 have, as you mentioned, 104, approximately,

1 currently operating nuclear plants. There are
2 license applications in the channel for 17 to 20 of
3 these, and others are being discussed. All of
4 those projected for the future are light water
5 reactors, none of the thorium reactors, none of
6 fast reactors, none of the liquid metal fuel
7 reactors. I encourage you to concentrate your
8 attention on what will be in the country in the
9 foreseeable future and, that is, light water
10 reactor, either a pressurized water reactor, or a
11 boiling water reactor, usually by Westinghouse or
12 GE. There are a couple of other foreign
13 manufacturers now, Hitachi and other companies.

14 One of the things I'm familiar with was
15 discussed earlier, and, that is, reactor fuel for
16 these light water reactors consists of uranium,
17 actually, within a ceramic, and that uranium is
18 about 5 percent U-235. Not very much of that is
19 used in the fuel cycle. Many of these plants run
20 for over a year. Then they have an outage. They
21 replace approximately one-third of the core. The
22 amount that is removed is currently stored in pools
23 at the plant where it remains for at least some
24 five years. Then it's often transferred to an

1 independent spent fuel maintenance facility that's
2 on site. I have inspected some of those.

3 It seems to me like not reprocessing
4 that fuel is kind of like removing oil from the
5 ground, using perhaps 5 percent of it and then
6 trying to store the rest of it. It seems like a
7 waste to me that -- there's a theory around
8 regarding fossil fuels. It's called Hubbert's
9 Peak. If you haven't seen it, I recommend you do a
10 Google of it and take a look. It basically
11 predicts that fossil fuels in this country will run
12 out in the relatively short term. We're going to
13 have to find some alternatives. I am very much in
14 favor of a mix, and I think nuclear should be part
15 of that mix. I think there's room for coal, water,
16 solar, wind. I've also visited some wind farms and
17 some solar farms. Very interesting.

18 Reprocessing will have some costs. It
19 will also have some benefits. It will reduce the
20 amount of fuel that has to be stored on site. It
21 will reduce the amount of space that will be taken
22 up in Yucca Mountain. And almost as an aside, some
23 90 to 100 percent of Chicago's electricity is
24 nuclear power. What you're enjoying right now is

1 nuclear power, lights, fans, et cetera. Even this
2 system here.

3 One misconception I think that I heard a
4 number of times during the earlier discussions is
5 nuclear waste, a portion of which is the spent
6 fuel. Other items that come from the plant are
7 lightly contaminated items and some high level
8 things, mostly spent resins from the water clean-up
9 process. As such, I'm in favor of reprocessing
10 spent nuclear fuel. Those of you who don't know,
11 the Morris location was at once going to be the
12 home of the Midwest fuel reprocessing plant. What
13 remains there in the spent fuel pool is actually
14 the facility that was going to store those rods
15 before processing at the plant. And there is a
16 considerable inventory there. Some of it's been
17 there for two decades. It doesn't even glow in the
18 dark anymore.

19 Thank you very much.

20 MR. BROWN (Facilitator): Tammy Thompson and
21 Scott Coren will be next.

22 MS. TAMMY THOMPSON: I guess I'd like to start
23 by asking the gentleman that was just speaking, did
24 you ever live by one of these plants?

1 MR. FOSTER: No.

2 MS. THOMPSON: Enough said there.

3 MR. FOSTER: On the other hand, I've spent
4 months inside of them.

5 MS. THOMPSON: I guess people aren't aware of
6 the fact that a lot of this stuff is transported by
7 truck and through communities all the time. In
8 fact, an acquaintance of mine's father, who she
9 just buried, spent 15 years driving it from one
10 facility to the other, where they drive up to the
11 plant, they claim they have radioactive materials
12 and then they're sent off somewhere else. It's no
13 surprise that this summer they buried him riddled
14 with cancer.

15 I was told to speak from the heart, and
16 from what I know and what I've experienced. I am
17 insulted and outraged that the community is not
18 involved and not informed of these things. My
19 neighbors are really ticked off. Perhaps the DOE,
20 GNEP, Argonne, the CEOs, Warren Buffet, Exelon and
21 all these guys are so determined to move forward
22 with these unfortunate and potentially
23 life-threatening and environmentally detrimental
24 plans with all this nuclear, and to put it nicely

1 when I explain it to my daughter, cocka, these
2 issues, to bury or recycle it in their own
3 backyards, instead of forcing it into ours. Maybe
4 then they will actually perform independent studies
5 as to whether or not these nuclear notions are
6 worth putting their own lives, property and
7 environment on the line or in jeopardy.

8 Take a look at their history so far,
9 which has not been stellar or worth bragging about
10 when it comes down to actual facts. Where has been
11 their accountability or responsibility?

12 This makes Will County only more at risk
13 than they already are. They refuse to acknowledge
14 or do anything to remedy any of these problems.
15 When we've called local government entities, we've
16 been told numerous times that we don't pay them
17 enough in taxes to do anything for our community.
18 That's a joke, considering most of these huge
19 multimillion, and billion and trillion dollar
20 organizations don't even pay their taxes,
21 meanwhile, bringing down our property values,
22 jeopardizing the employees', citizens' and
23 communities' health and environment.

24 We personally have called Will County

1 Emergency Management as local fire -- as well as
2 the local fire department to get -- we were told by
3 them to get used to it and get over it. If you're
4 interested, go see for yourself the potential
5 threats to our homeland security. Everyone that
6 goes out down Route 6 from Springfield and other
7 government entities that came through my
8 neighborhood are stupefied at the potential risks
9 and impacts. We're not as afraid of terrorist
10 threats, although in light of new circumstances,
11 that has changed, too. We, however, are afraid of
12 lots of accidents and stupidity. There is no
13 policing down Route 6, and the government keeps
14 passing the buck and placing responsibility on
15 everybody else.

16 Go through our neighborhood, then ask
17 yourself the question, what could happen. Then ask
18 how Channahon and Elwood and Minooka and Morris
19 have gone from small buildings to gigantic
20 townhalls. Furthermore, ask yourself how a small
21 town like Channahon and Elwood can be in the black
22 by millions of dollars when most other villages and
23 towns are in the red.

24 The comments from folks from Springfield

1 and Washington, D.C., when they come through the
2 area are, this is nicer than what's in the state
3 capital or that -- what's in downtown Chicago. How
4 can that be?

5 If you're lucky on the day that you take
6 your grand tour, you may be able to ask yourself,
7 what's that smell? Why I do feel nauseated? Why
8 are my eyes burning? What's that rash on my body
9 and where did this excruciating headache come from?
10 Then ask yourself, why isn't anybody doing anything
11 to help?

12 That's all I have been asking myself for
13 nearly ten years. Fair warning, this could be
14 coming to the neighborhood near you if it isn't
15 already in their economic plan. The reason I'm
16 here to speak, on behalf of my daughter, my family,
17 the many friends and neighbors who are too afraid
18 to speak or they can't speak, they're too sick and
19 they're too overwhelmed. We're consistently told
20 to sit down and shut up during public meetings. At
21 this time I don't have to worry about that here.
22 Our home was shot at, helicopters almost landed on
23 the roof of our house many times. I was run off
24 the road. We had men looking into our windows.

1 Our mail was frequently tampered with and even on
2 two occasions, men pulled up in vans telling me
3 that I would get dumped in one of the many
4 landfills in this area never to be heard from
5 again.

6 All we asked was, what's that smell,
7 where's it coming from and what can we do to stop
8 it? For nearly a decade this has been going on.
9 It's so overwhelming that you can't even gain
10 composure on Route 6. You're swerving at oncoming
11 traffic and each other.

12 The fact is Erin Brockovich called me of
13 her own accord. I didn't call her. She was busy
14 taking phone calls from neighborhoods in the Godley
15 and Braidwood communities. She tried to get us
16 help and some answers and resolutions in our
17 community, as many well other Illinoisans who tried
18 to help them themselves suffering in their own
19 communities, including, for the third time now on
20 the road -- in a row, President-Elect Obama.

21 Please stop treating our land, air and
22 water as typical commodities at the Exchange.
23 They're our most precious and invaluable, not just
24 valuable resources. We can't function one without

1 the other, so please clean up your mess before
2 forcing more bad ideas in the name of economic
3 development, a/k/a capitalism at its worst. The
4 public is never informed that it takes millions of
5 gallons of water to operate these nuclear
6 facilities in addition to all the chemical
7 companies, oil refineries and coal burning plants.

8 So where does all that contaminated
9 water go? Can it or will it be cleaned? Where
10 does all the sludge that's left over with the
11 contaminated stuff get dumped? Can it be cleaned?
12 Shame on Governor Blagojevich or anyone else who
13 thinks that this industry is good to bring to
14 Illinois when he can't even clean up his own messes
15 in his own backyard.

16 The potentially existing risks already
17 depend on which way the wind blows and the water
18 flows. I'm not a scientist, but I don't think it's
19 beneficial to allow the pumpage of potentially
20 radioactive sludge on the farmlands good or
21 healthy. Then there's the pumping of radioactive
22 water into the river to melt the ice. However, I
23 believe it may be doing more than just melting the
24 ice.

1 If you're intent on moving forward with
2 this nuclear stuff, then at least give people a
3 chance and issue them badges that are given to
4 flight attendants and hospital employees and
5 nuclear departments to determine how much radiation
6 that they're actually receiving.

7 We deserve green laws, land, air and
8 water solutions, not more hypocritical promises and
9 economic pollution. If this noncompliance,
10 nonattainment area and nuclear path process
11 continues, we'll have to change the pronunciation
12 from Illinois to "Ill-inois."

13 This is the letter from Barack Obama.

14 MR. BROWN (Facilitator): You're a bit over
15 time. If you can wrap-up. Thank you.

16 MS. THOMPSON: Okay. Well, I have all of this
17 information that I sent to his office. After he
18 was elected, this was the letter he just sent back
19 to me after he was elected.

20 MR. BROWN (Facilitator): Well, you have to
21 give the others --

22 FROM THE FLOOR: Let's hear the letter.

23 FROM THE FLOOR: Let her speak.

24 MR. BROWN (Facilitator): I am simply

1 suggesting --

2 FROM THE FLOOR: Let her speak.

3 MR. BROWN (Facilitator): I'm suggesting that
4 you can submit some of the other material.

5 MS. BAIMAN: We would like to hear it.

6 MS. THOMPSON: I'll submit the rest of the
7 stuff. The last sentence of this letter signed by
8 Barack Obama, dated November 19, 2008, as
9 President-Elect of the United States, "As this
10 process moves forward, I encourage you to reach out
11 to other Illinois federally elected officials for
12 assistance you may need regarding the federal
13 government or legislative issues before Congress."

14 Thank you.

15 MR. BROWN (Facilitator): Thanks very much.

16 MS. THOMPSON: Thank you.

17 MR. BROWN (Facilitator): Scott Coren.
18 Marilyn Shineflug will follow Scott.

19 MR. SCOTT COREN (City of Darien -
20 Environmental Committee): My name is Scott Coren.
21 I am with the City of Darien, Environmental
22 Committee staff liaison. I wanted to read a letter
23 that the City of Darien Environmental Committee
24 sent to Mr. Francis Schwartz, who is the document

1 manager for the GNEP PEIS.

2 "Dear Mr. Schwartz: Thank you for the.
3 opportunity to comment on the Global Nuclear
4 Energy Partnership, PEIS. Our committee, as
5 well the Darien City Council and many Darien
6 residents had participated in the previous
7 GNEP Programmatic Environmental Impact
8 Statement draft, providing comments on the
9 research activities and locations where such
10 research and projects may occur.

11 "Our committee is supportive of research
12 in many fields. The Department of Energy
13 through Argonne National Laboratory has
14 conducted many successful projects and
15 supports our community in a variety of ways.
16 However, we cannot endorse this project
17 without knowing more details that could have
18 a major impact upon our community. Specifics
19 such as the amount of nuclear material needed
20 to conduct such projects, how the material
21 would be stored, how the material would be
22 disposed, and exact details on transporting
23 the material need to be communicated and
24 known before an endorsement can be given.

1 Without such details, we cannot support this
2 program or locating a program such as this
3 near a dense population such as the City of
4 Darien.

5 "Respectfully, City of Darien
6 Environmental Committee, James Tikalsy, Deb
7 Hurdtk-Gemmell, Allan Jackimek, Philip Kohl,
8 Peggy McCauley, Arleta Peknik and Chris
9 Sant."

10 Thank you.

11 MR. BROWN (Facilitator): Thanks, Scott.

12 Marilyn Shineflug.

13 MS. MARILYN SHINEFLUG: Hi, everybody. Thank
14 you. I was told to mention that I was a previous
15 mayor of Antioch, Illinois, for eight years, and I
16 was a trustee in the Village of Lake Bluff. I have
17 been involved in and concerned about environmental
18 issues. I am not speaking for either of those
19 villages tonight.

20 I have been concerned about nuclear
21 power since the 1970s when I was living in DeKalb,
22 Illinois, and Dr. Robert Pollard from the Union of
23 Concerned Scientists came and spoke about the
24 Brown's Ferry fire and the lack of regulation by

1 the NRC, which he felt led to that. But just
2 briefly, without going over all that history, I
3 wanted to share with you tonight a study which I
4 believe somebody else has already mentioned. It's
5 called Risky Appropriations, Gambling U.S. Energy
6 Policy on the Global Nuclear Energy Partnership, so
7 it does apply directly to GNEP.

8 The primary author is David Schlissel
9 and contributing authors are Robert Alvarez and
10 Peter Bradford. Some of the supporting groups are
11 Friends of the Earth USA, Government Accountability
12 Project, Institute of Policy Studies and Southern
13 Alliance For Clean Energy. I am not taking credit
14 for this report myself. I wanted to make sure that
15 you're all aware of that.

16 I just wanted to read a little bit from
17 the Executive Summary. It says:

18 "This investigation by Synapse Energy.
19 Economics has found that, in general, GNEP is
20 an ill-conceived, poorly supported, rushed,
21 and technically and economically risky and
22 that only -- and technically and economically
23 risky program that only will begin to produce
24 benefits, if it ever does, four or more

1 decades in the future. Even if its unproven
2 technologies are shown to be viable, GNEP
3 also has the potential to inhibit the
4 adoption of more reasonable solutions to
5 global climate change by diverting resources
6 into an unproven and, most likely, a
7 prohibitively expensive nuclear option. GNEP
8 also would increase the danger of nuclear
9 proliferation and the potential for weapons grade
10 materials falling into the hands of hostile
11 or unstable nations and terrorist groups.
12 Finally, GNEP would make the U.S. the dumping
13 ground for radioactive waste from other
14 participating nations.

15 "More particularly, we have made the
16 following findings:

17 "No. 1. The Bush administration's
18 announced plan for GNEP lacks important
19 details about technical viability,
20 proliferation risks, waste streams and
21 ultimate life-cycle costs.

22 "No. 2. The administration has
23 presented no economic analysis of the costs
24 and benefits of the GNEP plan. Nor has it

1 compared GNEP to other technically feasible
2 and cost-effective alternatives. Such an
3 economic justification should be provided
4 before significant funds are appropriated for
5 GNEP?

6 "No. 3. Full implementation of GNEP
7 would represent a significant expansion and
8 redirection of the nuclear industry.

9 "No. 4. The reference technologies and
10 processes for GNEP already have been selected
11 by the Department of Energy. However, none
12 of these technologies and processes currently
13 exist in commercially viable applications.
14 In fact, few of the technologies and
15 processes that would be required for GNEP
16 have ever been shown to be viable in large
17 engineering-scaled demonstration projects.

18 "No. 5. The Bush administration's
19 proposed schedule for deployment of GNEP is
20 not feasible -- the technologies that would
21 be required to implement GNEP successfully;
22 would take decades to develop if, in fact,
23 they can be made technically and commercially
24 viable at all.

1 "No. 6. The administration's plan for
2 GNEP would rashly lock the United States into
3 decisions to deploy certain nuclear
4 technologies and processes well before R&D is
5 completed, demonstration projects tested and
6 operated and the chosen technologies and
7 processes are shown to be feasible and cost
8 effective.

9 "No. 7. Developing and deploying the
10 new facilities required for GNEP would likely
11 be prohibitively expensive.

12 "No. 8. GNEP would be an unreasonably;
13 expensive and slow option for addressing
14 global climate change.

15 "No. 9. GNEP would reverse the U.S.
16 practice of not reprocessing reactor waste.

17 "No. 10. It is unclear whether GNEP
18 would eliminate the need for additional
19 geologic waste repositories.

20 "No. 11. GNEP is unlikely to reduce the
21 risk of the proliferation of nuclear
22 materials.

23 "No. 12. Deployment of the facilities
24 that would be required in GNEP could entail

1 significant risks to the public health and
2 safety.

3 "No. 13," finally. "Implementation of
4 GNEP would require overcoming a number of
5 significant political challenges.

6 "A recent study by the National
7 Academies has concluded that the GNEP program
8 should not go forward. This assessment by
9 Synapse Energy Economics reaches the same
10 conclusion."

11 It's about a 50-page report. It's
12 available on the Internet. There again, it is
13 called Risky Appropriations, Gambling U.S. Policy
14 on the Global Nuclear Energy Partnership. It's
15 fully annotated. You know, it's not a situation
16 where just people's opinions are given. I found it
17 to be factual, and it's an excellent source of
18 information.

19 Thank you.

20 MR. BROWN (Facilitator): Thanks very much.

21 Morgan Davis is next and Morgan will be
22 followed by Carol Stark.

23 MS. MORGAN DAVIS (NA-YGN): Good evening. My
24 name's Morgan Davis, and I'm a representative of

1 the nuclear industry. I work at one of the plants
2 locally. I live in the areas where many of you are
3 from, from your speeches. I'm your neighbor.

4 So the reason I came here tonight is one
5 to learn, because I'm still learning, as well, but
6 also to tell you that I live and work at the
7 nuclear plants every day, and I choose this
8 industry because I see it every day. And I also
9 live right next to the plant. So if you put those
10 together, I see, you know, the concerns you have.

11 And I'm an engineer at the plant. I'm
12 actually a radiological waste engineer, so if you
13 have any questions, come see me afterwards, but
14 knowing what happens every day and knowing the
15 risks, concerns that you have, when I first came to
16 the industry, I had some of the same things, but
17 now that I see it every day and how we manage those
18 risks, I'm really -- my concerns are a lot less
19 now. So I just wanted to kind of put that out
20 there, because I know you guys have concerns, and
21 that's another reason why we're here is because you
22 are our neighbors, literally. Like we live in your
23 communities, and we want to make sure that you're
24 comfortable with what we're doing, too, and want to

1 be here to answer your questions and be a good
2 citizen, as well.

3 One thing that I'm concerned about, and
4 I know that utilities are concerned about, is that
5 we have a growing need for power. That's no
6 secret. We need about 20 percent more energy by
7 2030. And that's probably going to get even more
8 considering all the gadgets and the iPods and the
9 Xboxes and the quality of living we have here in
10 the U.S.

11 So we can talk about this. We can talk
12 about where energy is going to come from. And if
13 you're really against nuclear power, then you need
14 to really make an effort to conserve energy first.
15 Everybody needs to just conserve and cut back on
16 the things that you don't need. So that's like the
17 big message. And I am a strong believer that
18 renewables should be pursued but nuclear definitely
19 needs to be part of the solution, because
20 renewables only work 30 percent of the time.

21 So we need to address these issues as a
22 group because it's only working when the sun is
23 shining and the wind is blowing. This is the only
24 thing that can address 24/7, and energy is directly

1 tied with health care to power all the machines in
2 the hospital. We have a better quality of life
3 because of that, and also our economy, keeping jobs
4 here. Our manufacturing is dependent on cost of
5 energy, so we need to really look at these
6 solutions going forward.

7 The utilities are a big proponent of
8 closing the fuel cycle, because, basically,
9 everybody in this room about the waste, it takes --
10 for every person in this room, about the amount of
11 energy you use, you use about a golf ball size of
12 uranium, every person. If we were to recycle it,
13 it would be reduced to about a penny size, and that
14 is a huge, huge volume decrease as far as
15 management and storage, so I really want you guys
16 to consider that when you're looking at these
17 options.

18 Safety, that's a big concern. I'm
19 young. I haven't had my children yet. That's a
20 big concern for me working in the industry, and I,
21 too, have some of the same concerns you guys do.
22 But one thing that makes me feel comfortable is
23 that the U.S. has one of the best safety records
24 for nuclear power, and I know that going forward

1 any technology we choose will be making sure we
2 have the same standards going forward.

3 Transportation, yes. Nuclear fuel will
4 be having to move around the country. That's not a
5 secret. One thing I can tell you is I have seen
6 one of the dry storage containers. I have actually
7 hugged it, just to do it. And I received actually
8 no radiation from it. So it's very safe. We test
9 them. That is our job as engineers on site to make
10 sure that these are running properly and safely.
11 And my thing is, you know, all these other
12 countries are pursuing nuclear power. They are
13 taking control of their energy independence.

14 France has been doing this for a long
15 time. You don't see them freaking out about fossil
16 fuel prices, because they have independence. They
17 control their destiny with nuclear power. And they
18 have been transporting these dry casks for a long
19 time. So if they can do it, I think we can do it,
20 and we can do it that much better.

21 And one thing before I conclude my
22 comments, I just wanted to let you guys know that
23 there's a great website. It's www.NEI.org. and
24 they have a lot of good information, lots of papers

1 on capital costs, because that is a concern for the
2 industry. And there's a lot of information on the
3 fuel reprocessing, and it's got also a global
4 perspective on there also. And I will be available
5 for questions afterwards. Show of hands if you
6 have worked in the industry or you currently do,
7 can you please raise your hand real quick.

8 ... There was a show of hands ...

9 MS. DAVIS: So these people work in the
10 industry, and I really encourage you to go to them
11 and ask questions. And sometimes we'll agree to
12 disagree, but I'm here for you guys.

13 And that's it. End of my comments.

14 MR. BROWN (Facilitator): Thank you.

15 Okay. Carol Stark.

16 MS. CAROL STARK (CARE): Good evening. Thank
17 you for the opportunity to speak. I am not going
18 to reiterate because Kathy Gere and April and
19 others have already made many of the points that I
20 was going to make. I just want to say that safety
21 is one of the key issues that we all feel needs to
22 be addressed. There have been too many leaks at
23 various plants. There have been too many
24 Chernobyls. Accidents of that nature is not

1 something I don't -- I personally do not feel that
2 our country can handle something like that.

3 We know from our own small little
4 regional area that we can't handle, as Tammy
5 mentioned, a chemical spill, so how can we possibly
6 handle a nuclear catastrophe. Besides the safety
7 issue, the transportation of nuclear rods needs to
8 be addressed, and if we're going to be collecting
9 in one spot and taking in nuclear rods from all
10 over the world, they're going to be coming in by
11 boat, as well as train and rail. So we have to
12 realize that there are potential accidents that
13 could occur in the ocean. How are we going to
14 combat something like that?

15 I just think that this is an
16 ill-conceived plan. It's economically not
17 feasible, and that GNEP should be addressing
18 alternatives, and I don't believe that solar and
19 wind is something that should be ignored. I think
20 we should be concentrating on -- our efforts in
21 that area instead of an ill-conceived reprocessing
22 of nuclear fuel.

23 Thank you.

24 MR. BROWN (Facilitator): Thanks.

1 That concludes the list of folks who had
2 signed up ahead of time to speak. So let me ask if
3 there is anyone in the audience who hasn't yet made
4 a comment who would like to come up and comment at
5 this point.

6 Yes, in the back, please. Again, if you
7 can step to that microphone and identify yourself.

8 MS. MAUREEN HEADINGTON: My name is Maureen
9 Headington. I'm a resident of Burr Ridge. I'm a
10 grassroot environmental activist. I have been ever
11 since we moved to the western suburbs about
12 15 years ago. Had I known what was going on here,
13 I think I would have taken the home up in
14 Deerfield, because my life has not been the same
15 since.

16 First, there were the toxic waste
17 incinerators that were being -- and interesting,
18 all of these seem to be involved in the energy
19 sector, so I think that we are a hot bed for -- in
20 the western suburbs for these kinds of proposals.
21 The toxic waste burners that wanted to site, and I
22 quit my job to fight them, and actually we were
23 able to kill the Illinois retail rate law, which
24 would have been the taxpayer subsidy to get

1 incinerator developers to our state to build toxic
2 waste burners. We were supposed to have one of the
3 humdingers three miles from our house burning
4 railroad ties and utility poles brought from all
5 over the country by rail soaked in creosote. My
6 goodness, who wouldn't want to breathe that every
7 day.

8 Then there were the Napalm shipments out
9 of Fallbrook, California, Napalm left over from
10 Vietnam in leaking casks. Someone in the energy
11 sector had a great idea. We can burn this in a
12 cement kiln in East Chicago, Indiana, where the
13 regulations are less than in an incinerator, and we
14 were able to get those trains stopped, and that was
15 taking on the U.S. Navy, who was behind this. The
16 trains were stopped.

17 A number of organizations got involved
18 and I urge all of you, get involved in
19 environmental work. It's fabulous. You meet great
20 people. They turned the trains around that were
21 carrying the Napalm. There was a better way to do
22 it, because there were facilities, expensive, yes,
23 but wouldn't have caused problems.

24 Let's see. Then there -- all the old

1 coal plants. That I have 102 resolutions
2 representing over 8 million people for the last
3 eight years doing presentations evenings in front
4 of city councils and village boards. Marilyn
5 Shineflug, I know when you were mayor, I got a
6 resolution from you on the old coal plants
7 representing your constituents. We're trying to
8 get a better deal than what the governor has given
9 us, letting them burn for ten more years or so and
10 reap the profits in, and we're losing people 1300 a
11 year in Illinois alone because of all of this
12 particulate matter and knocks in the socks and the
13 things we're having to breathe.

14 Well, that brings me to this. I kept on
15 wondering, is my career in environmental work over.
16 I was asked to be on the Board of Directors of the
17 Illinois Environmental Council, which I served for
18 six years, the last two as vice president. It
19 boggles the mind that there's yet another, and I
20 don't know, I don't want to be disparaging, but I
21 consider this a scheme. It is a money maker, and
22 someone sent me an e-mail from the Salt Lake
23 Tribune -- Salt Lake Tribune in Utah about a
24 company called Energy Solutions.

1 Interestingly, because people haven't
2 really addressed this behind the scenes and where
3 the bucks are, because usually if you follow the
4 money, you get the real story. So I'm hoping some
5 of the reporters here will do some research, as I
6 have, but Energy Solutions had been vying quite
7 vehemently for a contract to reprocess nuclear
8 waste in the UK. And this reporter noticed that
9 Energy Solutions had suddenly withdrawn from
10 negotiations. Now, why would they have done that?

11 They're sitting back on their haunches
12 waiting for us to reprocess here in the U.S.
13 because instead of the \$5 billion contract, there
14 is an estimate in the next 10 to 15 years of a
15 hundred to \$150 billion. So there are folks in
16 this industry that stand to make huge profits, and
17 we're the ones who are going to have to pay the
18 price, either in terms of our lives, god forbid
19 ever an accident, and I always tell folks when I
20 speak, I am not anti-Argonne.

21 Argonne Labs does many wonderful
22 projects. I just don't feel that they should be
23 embracing projects involving nuclear waste. They
24 have the misfortune of being in a metropolitan

1 community that -- where there's homes and schools
2 and businesses.

3 Someone mentioned Price-Anderson.

4 Price-Anderson gives a cap on what the utility --
5 what the nuclear waste, the nuclear world has to
6 pay in restitution, and the rest of the money from
7 lawsuits comes from us. So we're paying it at
8 every inconceivable -- the danger to this is in the
9 transport. So I'm not concerned about the site. I
10 don't care if it's in Illinois or at the other end
11 of the country. Metro Chicago is a hub. Those
12 trucks will be coming through Metro Chicago on
13 I-55, and if you look at the maps for Yucca
14 Mountain, you'll see that everything convenes over
15 here. It will be coming from north, south, east,
16 west, wherever this is; I-55, 294, I-88, I-80.
17 These were interstates that were told us last year
18 when Morris was being considered. I think that
19 they're wise not to be looking at a site, because,
20 as I was told by Mr. Quirk, who kindly informed me
21 of this hearing and told me that we wouldn't be
22 doing sites at this meeting, only public policy and
23 technology, how on earth can you go to technology
24 when you haven't established policy?

1 And how on earth -- this thing, the
2 train's already left the station on this, folks.
3 Twenty-five foreign countries have signed up to
4 send us their nuclear waste. I left materials on
5 that back table. I urge you take one of everything
6 there.

7 SOS, we got to get our communities
8 involved, Save Our Suburbs. Call your townhalls,
9 your county board, and say, "Follow the examples
10 set by the Village of Burr Ridge, the City of
11 Darien, Cook County Board." The Cook County Board,
12 for Pete's sake. Cook County is trying to save the
13 lives of people in DuPage where Argonne is
14 situated, and the DuPage County Board, nowhere to
15 be found on this. And almost every town I have
16 tried to make contact with in DuPage won't return
17 calls. And when someone does, I get the talking
18 points that have been given them. Well, it's only
19 going to be a little bit, or we need to be good
20 global citizens. When I heard that from the chair
21 of the Environmental Committee at Hinsdale why she
22 wouldn't put us on an agenda, because a resident
23 there asked if I'd come and speak.

24 MR. BROWN (Facilitator): If you can wrap up

1 and make one final comment.

2 MS. HEADINGTON: I'm telling you that in this
3 day and age, we have learned from very close
4 elections, regardless of the money that's behind a
5 lot of these things, the incentives, the subsidies,
6 the power of your vote and your voice is what makes
7 a difference. It's why we aren't dealing with
8 toxic waste burners in this state right now,
9 because we killed 34 such projects with the law we
10 did. Go and call your village hall and tell every
11 one of your friends and coworkers and family, call
12 your village halls. I want to see a thousand
13 resolutions from towns and county boards.

14 Look up -- I didn't bring any, but if
15 you want to contact me, I will provide you the Cook
16 County Board resolution. Every single
17 commissioner, whether a Democrat or Republican,
18 asked to sign on as a cosponsor, and that's the
19 kind of leadership we should have and force the
20 issue with the DuPage County Board, get them to
21 step up to the plate, because back when Gayle
22 Franzen was the chair of it. They tried bringing
23 low level waste in in the 1990s, I think '95, and
24 he said the people of this region do not want it.

1 And now we have different leadership. Both he and
2 Harris Fawell didn't want it. Change of
3 leadership. Judy Biggert, she's the darling of
4 Argonne.

5 MR. BROWN (Facilitator): Thanks.

6 MS. HEADINGTON: And Mr. Shillerstrom. And
7 these people need to hear from you. Please be
8 vocal. It's in your hands.

9 Thank you.

10 MR. BROWN (Facilitator): Thank you.

11 (Applause)

12 Let me ask if there's anybody else in
13 the audience who has not yet made a comment who
14 would like to add anything?

15 Is there anyone who has spoken who would
16 like to add any further comments?

17 Okay.

18 MR. GEORGE STREJCEK: I have a letter I
19 received from Argonne National Laboratory --

20 MR. BROWN (Facilitator): I hope it's a short
21 letter.

22 MR. STREJCEK: It's a short letter, yeah.

23 THE REPORTER: You have got to come up to the
24 microphone.

1 MR. BROWN (Facilitator): We had a lavalier
2 mic which I turned down, but you seem to have an
3 impulse to roam.

4 MR. STREJCEK: I was a teacher, so I moved
5 around a lot to hit the students for falling asleep
6 and so forth.

7 MR. BROWN (Facilitator): Well, anyway.

8 MR. STREJCEK: Okay. This is dated July 2008.
9 It was delivered to me. It's from Dr. Robert
10 Rosner, director -- office director, Argonne
11 National Laboratory.

12 "I am writing to let you know that.
13 Argonne, along with five other national
14 laboratory sites, is no longer being
15 considered as a possible site for
16 construction of an advanced fuel cycle
17 facility to support the U.S. Department of
18 Energy's Global Nuclear Energy Program, GNEP.
19 In fact, DOE is reevaluating GNEP's
20 technology and the facility it needs in light
21 of some 14,000 comments received during
22 public comment period for GNEP's Programmatic
23 Environmental Impact Statement, PEIS. Any
24 future siting proposals will be made in light

1 of GNEP's reevaluated needs and would require
2 a new round of PEIS hearings and public
3 comment. DOE's decision comes at a time when
4 Argonne is also reevaluating its nuclear
5 energy strategy given new scientific and
6 engineering opportunities. Specifically,
7 today's high performance computers make it
8 possible to develop new computer models that
9 will begin with the fundamental physics of
10 the atom and build up to assimilate every
11 detail of an operating nuclear reactor or
12 reprocessing facility in unprecedented detail
13 and accuracy."

14 I'll skip down to the last paragraph.

15 "We believe that Argonne is well
16 positioned to help the nation realize this
17 vision by virtue of its world class expertise
18 in experimental and computing facilities in
19 basic material science, nuclear chemistry and
20 engineering, chemical engineering and high
21 performance modeling and simulation."

22 I just want to make one final comment.

23 I think the government should proceed with this
24 program, okay, substituting what the Russians are

1 using now, lead-bismuth, as opposed to sodium, as a
2 reactor coolant. Also, I have a recommendation
3 site for this facility, Crawford, Texas, or
4 Kennebunkport, Maine.

5 Thank you. (Laughter and applause)

6 MR. BROWN (Facilitator): Okay. Any other
7 comments?

8 I think, then, noting that no one else
9 has any comments to make, we are officially
10 adjourned.

11 Thanks very much.

12 (WHEREUPON, the hearing was
13 adjourned at 9:15 p.m.)

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

1 STATE OF ILLINOIS)

2) SS:

3 COUNTY OF DU PAGE)

4 I, JACQUELINE M. TIMMONS, a Certified
5 Shorthand Reporter of the State of Illinois, do
6 hereby certify that I reported in shorthand the
7 proceedings had at the hearing aforesaid, and that
8 the foregoing is a true, complete and correct
9 transcript of the proceedings of said hearing as
10 appears from my stenographic notes so taken and
11 transcribed under my personal direction.

12 IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I do hereunto set my
13 hand at Chicago, Illinois, this 20th day of
14 December, 2008.

15

16

17 Certified Shorthand Reporter

18

19 C.S.R. Certificate No. 84-2949.

20

21

22

23

24